Appl. No. 10/595,145 Amdt. Dated October 22, 2010 Reply to Office action of July 22, 2010 Attorney Docket No. P18227-US1 EUS/GJ/P/10-6539

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.) Claim Amendments

Claims 1-7 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

2.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claims 5-7 and 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,097,798 to Albers, *et al.* ("*Albers*") in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0190689 in the name of Pelaez, *et al.* ("*Pelaez*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The proposed *Albers-Pelaez* combination fails to disclose, teach, or suggest every element of the rejected claims.

For example, Claim 1 recites:

Method for monitoring media session flow in a telecommunication network comprising a media-handling node through which, sessions between subscribers are transported via first ports and second ports comprising the following steps:

assigning an extra port to the media-handling node of an internet protocol multimedia subsystem domain for each new session that is transported through the node;

storing in a database, identification of a first subscriber for which monitoring is desired;

setting up a connection between the first subscriber and a second subscriber;

assigning an extra port that is adherent to the session between the first and second subscriber;

connecting the assigned extra port that is adherent to the session between the first and second subscriber;

monitoring the session between the first and second subscriber via the connected extra port.

The proposed *Albers-Pelaez* combination fails to disclose, teach, or suggest every element of Claim 1. For example, the proposed *Albers-Pelaez* combination fails to disclose "assigning an extra port to the media-handling node for each new session that is transported through the node." In addressing a related element of Claim 5, the Office Action cites to a portion of *Albers* that describes a "5ess" switch having a fixed

Appl. No. 10/595,145 Amdt. Dated October 22, 2010 Reply to Office action of July 22, 2010 Attorney Docket No. P18227-US1 EUS/GJ/P/10-6539

number of presumably hardware "interface modules 51," each with a fixed number of interface units. Office Action, p. 4. According to *Albers*, the interface units in each interface module include an "interface unit 0" that connects the interface module to an "enforcement agency terminal 122" that can monitor traffic passing through the interface module. *Albers*, col. 10, II. 9-30. However, the cited portion of *Albers* does not indicate that the number of interface modules, the number of interface units, or specifically the number of interface units that connect to the enforcement agency terminal are dependent on the number of sessions transported through the 5ess switch. Instead, Albers indicates only that "[t]he interface modules 51 each include a number of interface units 0 to n." Albers, col. 10, II. 14-15. Thus, the cited portion of Albers does not disclose "assigning an extra port to the media-handling node *for each new session* that is transported through the node" (emphasis added) as recited by Claim 1.

As a result, the proposed Albers-Pelaez combination fails to disclose, teach, or suggest every element of Claim 1. Although of differing scope from Claim 1, Claim 5 includes elements that are not disclosed, taught, or suggested by the cited references at least for analogous reasons to those discussed with respect to Claim 1. Claims 1 and 5 are thus allowable for at least these reasons. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1 and 5, and their respective dependent claims.

Appl. No. 10/595,145

Amdt. Dated October 22, 2010

Reply to Office action of July 22, 2010 Attorney Docket No. P18227-US1

EUS/GJ/P/10-6539

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently

pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore,

respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of

Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions

or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of

the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Todd A. Cason, Reg No 54,020/

Todd A. Cason Registration No. 54,020

Date: October 22, 2010

Ericsson Inc. 6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11 Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-8510 todd.cason.@ericsson.com